



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W/
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/077,367	02/15/2002	Leonard Ekkert	81553	3718
7590	03/30/2004		EXAMINER	
Gerald T. Shekleton, Esq. Welsh & Katz, Ltd. 22nd Floor 120 S. Riverside Plaza Chicago, IL 60606			NGO, LIEN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3727	12
DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/077,367	EKKERT, LEONARD
	Examiner LIEN TM NGO	Art Unit 3727

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17, 19 and 20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 12/01/03 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 12/4/03 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. patent 6,257,432 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Drawings

The proposed drawing correction filed on 12/4/03 has been disapproved because it is not in the form of a pen-and-ink sketch showing changes in red ink or with the changes otherwise highlighted. See MPEP 608.02 (v)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In claim 1, "said lip extending outwardly from ...the lip having an interior sealing surface" is not supported in the specification.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 3727

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 14-17, "the texture" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DeMeo (5,972,292). In regard to claims 7-11, DeMeo disclose in figs. 1 and 4, and col. 4 lines 9-19, col. 8, lines 39-34, col. 9, lines 10-19, and col. 10, lines 55-67, a container assembly comprising a sealing surface of at least one of a group of the container and the cap is prepared to have a desired texture, wherein the cap includes a protrusions 23 being the sealing of the cap, and the container includes a neck 15 being the sealing surface of the container. In regard to claim 12, the container further comprises a ledge 13 as a stopping surface (see col. 5, lines 1-5), and therefore, the sealing surface deformation can be limited by contacting between stopping surfaces blocking tighter engagement of the cap with the container.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim (WO 01/43554).

In regard to claims 1-5, Kim discloses, in fig. 5c, a container assembly comprising a neck forming a flexible lip 23 ending outwardly from the top of the neck to form a sealing surface to a cap, and at least one surface of the sealing surfaces having texture.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uhlig (4,351,443) in view of DeMeo.

Uhlig discloses, in figs. 9-12, a container assembly comprising a neck forming a flexible lip extending outwardly from the top of the neck to form a sealing surface to a cap.

Uhlig does not disclose at least one surface of the sealing surfaces having texture.

DeMeo teaches at least one surface of sealing surfaces in a container/cap having texture.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art as the time the invention was made to provide the sealing surfaces in Uhlig have texture, as taught by DeMeo, in order to allow gas flowing into or out of the container assembly.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeMeo or Kim. DeMeo or Kim does not disclose the texture ranging as claimed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the DeMeo or Kim texture in the ranges as claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claim 13-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9, 3 and 14 of

Art Unit: 3727

U.S. Patent No. 6,260,722 in view of DeMeo (5,972,292), see the office action paper 7, page 6.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-12 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the novel limitations of the applicant invention, as stated in the remark of page 10, are not required in the claims.

15. The Terminal disclaimer filed 12/4/03 is overcome the obviousness-type double patenting over US patent 6,257,432, but cannot overcome the obviousness-type double patent over US patent 6,260,722 because no terminal disclaimer is indicated to patent 6,260,722 that is filled.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LIEN TM NGO whose telephone number is 703-305-0294. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM -6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LEE YOUNG can be reached on 703-308-2572. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3727

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lien Ngo

March 22, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lien Ngo".